IN THE CLAIMS

Claims 5 and 6 are cancelled without prejudice or disclaimer. Claims 1 and 7-9 remain pending. The remaining claims are amended as set forth below:

OK to enter 06/24/02 DC

1. (Twice amended) A polypeptide which activates GFRα1-RET but does not substantially activate GFRα2-RET or GFRα3-RET, wherein

(a) said polypeptide comprises a persephin as set forth in SEQ ID NO:1, and further comprises substitutions in region F2a and substitutions in region F2c,

(b) the substitutions in region F2a comprise from one to eight amino acids that are identical to region F2a of a GDNF family ligand,

(c) the substitutions in region F2c comprise from one to eight amino acids that are identical to region F2c of a GDNF family ligand,

(d) the GDNF family ligand is a peptide of SEQ ID NO:4.

7. (Amended) The polypeptide of claim 1, comprising SEQ ID NO:23.

8. (Amended) The polypeptide of claim 1, consisting of SEQ ID NO:26.

Remarks

The claims of the instant application stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph as being non-enabled for the elected polypeptides. Enablement under the law requires that the specification describe to one skilled in the art "how to make and use the invention." The standard for determining whether the specification is enabled for the claimed invention is whether *unreasonable or undue* experimentation is needed to practice the invention, not whether any experimentation is necessary (*In re Angstadt*, 537 F.2d 498, 504, 190 USPQ 214, 219 (CCPA 1976)). Under current USPTO examination practice, the "Wands Factors" are considered when determining whether claims are enabled. Those factors are (a) breadth of claims, (b) nature of the invention, (c) state of the prior art, (d) level of skill in the art, (e) predictability of the art, (f) amount